

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01296 01 OF 02 081949Z

64

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-03 INR-07 L-02 ACDA-05

NSAE-00 PA-01 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00 SAJ-01

EB-07 COME-00 SS-15 NSC-05 /068 W

----- 093685

R 081500Z MAR 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 529

INFO SECDEF WASHDC

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

CINCUSNAVEUR

JCS WASHDC

AMEMBASSY ANKARA

AMEMBASSY ATHENS

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 1296

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: MARR NATO TU

SUBJ: DPC MEETING 7 MARCH 1975, ITEM II: PROPOSED GUIDANCE TO
THE INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE PENDING CLARIFICATION OF RELATIONS
WITH GREECE

REFS: A. STATE 050670

B. USNATO 1217

SUMMARY: DPC REMAINED DEADLOCKED AS SYG REPORTED NO RESPONSE
FROM GREEKS TO PROPOSALS HE HAD MADE ON BEHALF OF DPC, AND ERALP
(TURKEY) UNDER INSTRUCTIONS RE-STATED HARD LINE ON GREEK INFRA-
STRUCTURE WHICH HE DELIVERED IN DPC 30 JAN AND 25 FEB 75. CANADA,
NETHERLANDS, US, AND FRG SPOKE FOR MAJORITY IN SUPPORTING PO/75/1
AND QUICK APPROVAL SLICE 25. END SUMMARY.

1. SYG LUNS OPENED DISCUSSION BY REPORTING THAT GREEKS HAD NOT
YET REPLIED TO PROPOSALS, ON BEHALF OF DPC, THAT GREEKS WAIVE 2
PCT ADMINISTRATIVE CHARGE FOR SLICE XXV PROJECTS WHICH MIGHT
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01296 01 OF 02 081949Z

LATER BE CANCELLED AND THAT THEY AGREE TO THE PROCEDURE ON SLICE
XXV GREEK PROJECTS SET OUT IN PO/75/1. ERALP THEN MADE FOLLOWING
STATEMENT WHICH WAS PRINCIPAL PURPOSE OF ITEM II:
BEGIN TEXT.

AT OUR MEETING HELD ON 30TH JANUARY I HAD OUTLINED THE POSITION OF TURKEY REGARDING THE INTERIM GUIDANCE REQUIRED TO BE GIVEN TO INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEES CONCERNING FUNDING OF INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS LOCATED IN GREECE.

MY AUTHORITIES HAVE STUDIED THE CANADIAN PROPOSALS PERTAINING TO THIS SUBJECT WHICH SEEMED TO BE ACCEPTABLE TO MOST MEMBERS AND WHICH AT FIRST SIGHT SEEMED TO BE MORE OR LESS SATISFACTORY.

NOW MY AUTHORITIES HAVE GIVEN FURTHER THOUGHT TO THE MATTER. IN THEIR VIEW IF THE CANADIAN FORMULA IS ACCEPTED NATO WOULD CONTINUE TO FINANCE AMONGST OTHERS "PROJECTS LOCATED IN GREECE WHICH WERE AUTHORIZED PRIOR TO 28TH AUGUST AND FOR WHICH FUNDS WERE COMMITTED", BUT ON WHICH NO WORK HAD YET STARTED.

IN OTHER WORDS, CONSTRUCTION WILL BE STARTED ON PROJECTS WHICH WERE COMMON-FUNDED AFTER THE WITHDRAWAL OF GREECE FROM MILITARY INTEGRATION. WE CONSIDER THIS NOT ONLY ILLOGICAL BUT ALSO AT VARIANCE WITH NATO RULES WHICH REQUIRE PROJECTS TO BE BASED ON MILITARY NECESSITY.

ON THE OTHER HAND, THE SUPPOSITION THAT THE CESSATION OF PROJECTS ALREADY UNDER CONSTRUCTION MIGHT GIVE RISE TO CLAIMS AGAINST NATO, CANNOT BE VALID IN VIEW OF THE FACT THAT THE CESSATION OF THE PROJECTS IS A CONSEQUENCE OF A UNILATERAL ACTION, NAMELY WITHDRAWAL, TAKEN BY GREECE. WE THEREFORE DEEM IT APPROPRIATE THAT THE INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEES SHOULD, BY STUDYING EACH PROJECT ON A "CASE BY CASE" BASIS, CLARIFY THE LEGAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE CESSATION OF NATO FUNDING OF GREEK PROJECTS IN THE LIGHT OF MUTUAL OBLIGATIONS. INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS ARE THOSE THAT HAVE BEEN AUTHORIZED, WHICH THE MILITARY INTEGRATED MEMBER COUNTRIES CONSIDER NECESSARY ACCORDING TO PLANS FOR COMMON CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 01296 01 OF 02 081949Z

USE IN PEACE TIME.

WITHDRAWAL FROM MILITARY INFRASTRUCTURE WOULD NATURALLY ENTAIL THE RELEASE OF GREECE FROM THE RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS OF THE PLANNING, IMPLEMENTATION AND USE OF SUCH PROJECTS. AS TO A GUARANTEE TO BE GIVEN BY GREECE THAT SUCH PROJECTS SHALL BE DESTINED TO COMMON USE THIS COULD CREATE A NEW PROCEDURE. EVEN IF SUCH A GUARANTEE IS OBTAINED THIS NEW PROCEDURE WOULD CHANGE THE CHARACTER OF SUCH PROJECTS WHICH WOULD NO LONGER BE PART OF THE NATO INFRASTRUCTURE SYSTEM.

THIS VIEW OF MY AUTHORITIES IS NOT BASED ON AN EMO-

TIONAL REACTION AGAINST GREECE. HOWEVER IT IS OBVIOUS THIS NEW PROCEDURE WOULD CREATE A PRECEDENT WHEREBY IT WOULD BE OPEN TO ANY MEMBER COUNTRY TO CONTINUE TO ENJOY THE BENEFITS OF ALLIANCE INTEGRATION WHILE DIVESTING ITSELF OF ITS OBLIGATIONS.

PUBLIC OPINION IN OTHER COUNTRIES WOULD WONDER WHY OTHER MEMBERS WHO CONTINUE TO ASSUME THEIR OBLIGATIONS DO NOT ACCEPT THIS ADVANTAGEOUS PROCEDURE. IN OTHER WORDS, THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN WITHDRAWAL FROM AND REMAINING IN THE INTEGRATED STRUCTURE WOULD BE HARD TO EXPLAIN. WE FULLY SHARE THE DESIRE TO ENCOURAGE GREECE TO RETURN TO INTEGRATION, BUT THE LIMITS TO SUCH ENCOURAGEMENT SHOULD BE SET IN THE LIGHT OF THE ABOVE CONSIDERATIONS.

TO CONTINUE TO ACT ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT GREECE WILL ONE DAY RETURN TO INTEGRATION IS ON THE CONTRARY, LIABLE TO ENCOURAGE GREECE TO PERSIST IN THIS VAGUE AND PRIVILEGED POSITION. CONVERSELY, WE HOLD THE VIEW THAT IT WOULD BE MORE BENEFICIAL TO THE ALLIANCE TO INDUCE GREECE PROMPTLY TO CLARIFY HER STANDING WITHIN THE ALLIANCE.

I AM, THEREFORE, UNDER INSTRUCTIONS TO REQUEST THE DPC TO ADAPT THE GUIDANCE TO THE INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEES WHICH I OUTLINED AT THE DPC MEETING ON JANUARY 30TH AND THE TEXT OF WHICH I HAVE CIRCULATED.

END TEXT.
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 01296 01 OF 02 081949Z

2. MENZIES (CANADA) WAS FIRST TO RESPOND POINTING OUT THAT GREAT MAJORITY OF DPC BELIEVE THEY SHOULD NOT MAKE IT MORE DIFFICULT FOR GREECE TO RETURN TO FULL NATO PARTICIPATION. HE STRESSED IMPORTANCE OF PROTECTING NATO INVESTMENT OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN GREECE AND REPEATED HIS SUGGESTION RE DEMANDING GREEK ASSURANCES ON CONTINUED NATO ACCESS TO FACILITIES. TURKISH POSITION, WHILE LEGALLY CORRECT, WAS PUSHING PROCESS OF RENEGOTIATION WITH GREECE FASTER THAN REST OF DPC WISH TO GO. HE AGREED THAT ONE COUNTRY COULD BLOCK ANY NATO ACTION BUT THAT IT IS NORMAL PROCEDURE TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT VIEWS OF MAJORITY. HE ASKED ERALP TO CONVEY THOSE VIEWS TO HIS AUTHORITIES.

3. AFTER BRIEF SUPPORTING STATEMENT BY DE STAERCKE (BELGIUM) ERALP OBSERVED THAT TURKEY AND MAJORITY ARE INDEED PULLING IN DIFFERENT DIRECTIONS. IN TURKISH VIEW, TIME FOR GREEKS TO DECIDE ON THEIR NATO PARTICIPATION IS RUNNING OUT. HE ASKED FOR CAREFUL CONSIDERATION BY DPC AND ALLIED GOVERNMENTS OF TURKISH VIEWS.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 01296 02 OF 02 082343Z

60

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-03 INR-07 L-02 ACDA-05

NSAE-00 PA-01 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00 SAJ-01

EB-07 COME-00 SS-15 NSC-05 /068 W

----- 095056

R 081500Z MAR 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 530

INFO SECDEF WASHDC

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

CINCUSNAVEUR

JCS WASHDC

AMEMBASSY ANKARA

AMEMBASSY ATHENS

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 1296

4. LUNS POINTED OUT IN RATHER BLUNT FASHION THAT ERALP WAS IN ERROR ON ONE POINT AND THAT GREECE HAS IN FACT NOT WITHDRAWN. WITHDRAWAL HAS BEEN A POLITICAL POSSIBILITY, BUT GREECE WANTS TO NEGOTIATE AND IT IS SIMPLY FOR DPC TO CONSIDER HOW TO AVOID OBSTRUCTING NEGOTIATIONS. LUNS WENT ON TO SUGGEST THAT DPC TAKE NOTE OF REQUEST OF MAJORITY TO ERALP TO CONVEY THEIR VIEWS TO HIS AUTHORITIES, THAT DPC REGRETS TURKISH POSITION AND HOPES ANKARA WILL RECONSIDER.

5. HARTOGH (NETHERLANDS) OBSERVED THAT WHILE THERE IS A DIVISION OF APPROACH IN DPC, NO ALLY WANTS GREECE TO WITHDRAW, AND THEREFORE QUESTION BEFORE DPC IS SIMPLY WHICH APPROACH WILL BEST ACHIEVE DPC OBJECTIVE. HE DISAGREED WITH ERALP'S STATEMENT THAT DPC IS GIVING GREEKS TOO MUCH TIME AND POINTED OUT THAT IF GREEK HADN IS FORCED AND THEY WITHDRAW COMPLETELY, QUOTE ALL WILL SUFFER UNQUOTE.

6. LUNS REFERRED TO HIS PRE-DPC MEETING WITH ERALP IN WHICH LUNS HAD EXPLAINED BENEFITS TO NATO OF PROJECTS IN GREECE AND CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01296 02 OF 02 082343Z

BELIEVED THAT MOST USERS ARE NATO ITSELF AND ALLIES OTHER THAN GREECE.

HE PROPOSED THAT NO ACTION BE TAKEN ON TURKISH REQUEST UNTIL HE HAD RECEIVED GREEK REPLY.

7. ERALP AGREED WITH HARTOGH THAT THE ISSUE IS BASICALLY ONE OF APPROACH AND THAT TURKS SIMPLY BELIEVE IT IS TIME FOR GREEKS TO MAKE UP THEIR MINDS. AS FOR IDEA OF A GREEK GUARANTEE

OF ACCESS, QUOTE IF THEY GIVE IT, IT WOULD BE OF NO VALUE UNQUOTE.
HE ADDED THAT OF THE 43PCT OF NATO PROJECTS IN GREECE USED BY
GOG, GREAT PREPONDERANCE ARE AIRFIELDS.

8. BRUCE (US) SAID HE HAD RAISED THE QUESTION OF SLICE XXV
ON PREVIOUS OCCASIONS. HE HOPED THAT DPC COULD FIND A QUICK SOL-
UTION TO THE PROBLEM OF GREEK INFRASTRUCUTRE AND ONE THAT WOULD
BE SATISFACTORY TO ALL ALLIES. HIS AUTHORITIES HAD INSTRUCTED HIM
TO STRONGLY REAFFIRM THEIR SUPPORT OF PROPOSALS MADE IN PO/75/1.
AS LUNS HAD ALREADY OBSERVED, QUESTIONS WHICH HAD BEEN RAISED ABOUT
ON-GOING PROJECTS IN GREECESHOULD HAVE NO BEARING ON DPC
APPROVAL OF SLICE XXV. HE HOPED THAT DPC COULD AT LEAST
PROCEED WITH THAT ACTION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS SPECIFIED IN
PO/75/1 AND THE ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS LAID DOWN BY UK.

9. BOSS (FRG DCM) STRONGLY SUPPORTED BRUCE'S REMARKS ON
URGENCY OF SLICE XXV APPROVAL. BEFOE HE COULD GO FURTHER, LUNS
INTERVENED TO SAY THAT HE HAD TO MAKE CLEAR THAT TURKS ARE IN FACT
NOT BLOCKING SLICE XXV APPROVAL. HE THEN IMMEDIAGELY PROCEEDED TO
THE FOLLOWING ITEM.

10. MISSION COMMENT: MISSION HAS SOME REASON TO BELIEVE THAT
LUNS' ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT TURKEY'S POSITION ON SLICE XXV MAY BE
OVERLY OPTIMISTIC. IF ON OTHER HAND ERALP PERMITS RECORD ON 30
JAN 75 MEETING AND THIS MEETING TO STAND, IT IS POSSIBLE THAT WE
NEED ONLY BE CONCERNED WITH OUTSTANDING CANADIAN CONFIRMATION AND
NEED FOR GREEK REPLY TO UK CONDITION ON 2 PCT ADMINISTRATIVE
CHARGES IN ORDER TO HAVE AFULLY AGREED SLICE.BRUCE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 08 MAR 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: CunninFX
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO001296
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750398/abbrziqp.tel
Line Count: 246
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. STATE 050670 B. USNATO 1217
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: CunninFX
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 25 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <25 APR 2003 by CunninFX>; APPROVED <23 SEP 2003 by CunninFX>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: DPC MEETING 7 MARCH 1975, ITEM II: PROPOSED GUIDANCE TO THE INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE PENDING
CLARIFICATION OF RELATIONS WITH GREECE
TAGS: MARR NATO TU
To: STATE INFO SECDEF
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
CINCUSNAVEUR
JCS

ANKARA
ATHENS

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006